DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 681 CG 009 735

AUTHOR	Figley, Charles R.; And Others
TITLE	The Purdue LEAD Program: Implications for Other Educational Contexts.
INSTITUTION	Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind. Dept. of Child Development and Family Life.
PUB DATE	18 Feb 75
NOTE	25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Indiana Council on Family Relations (Muncie, Indiana, February 1975)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Students; Educational Innovation; *Family Life Education; Individual Development; *Leadership; *Peer Teaching; *Program Descriptions; Program Development
IDENTIFIERS	LEAD; *Leadership Effectiveness and Development Program; Purdue

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is threefold: (1) to describe briefly the Purdue Leadership Effectiveness and Development (LEAD) Program operating within the Department of Child Development and Family Life; (2) to review other programs with similar characteristics in other areas and at other levels of education; and (3) to discuss briefly the implications of the approach for family life education classes. The Purdue LEAD Program is characterized as a dual-approach instructional system in that it provides an undergraduate course in leadership aimed at developing skills particularly relevant to leading college discussion groups and, at the same time, furnishes qualified and supervised discussion group leaders to enhance the effectiveness of instruction in the large marriage and family relationships courses. In the appendix of this report, the authors have included a variety of materials which should be helpful in developing a similar program within most educational contexts. (Author/PC)

ED106681

The Purdue LEAD Program: Implications for Other Educational Contexts[1]

Charles R. Figley, Ph.D.
Purdue University

Robert T. Groman, B.S.
Purdue University

David L. Weis, B. S.
Purdue University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[1]Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Indiana Council on Family Relations, Muncie, Indiana, February 18, 1975.

[2]The first author is the Director of the Purdue LEAD Program and is an Assistant Professor of Family Studies. The second and third authors are Assistant Directors of the Program and graduate students in the Department of Child Development and Family Life.

CG009735

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is threefold: (a) to briefly describe the Purdue Leadership Effectiveness and Development (LEAD) Program operating within the Department of Child Development and Family Life, (b) to review other programs with similar characteristics in other areas and at other levels of education, (c) to briefly discuss the implications of the approach for family life education classes. In the appendix we have included a variety of material which should be helpful in developing a similar program within most educational contexts.

Structure of the LEAD Program

The Purdue LEAD Program was developed primarily to deal with the increasing number of students who enroll in popular "Marriage and Family Relationships" course (CDFL 350). Class size has steadily increased during the last few years while the opportunity for discussions within the classroom has become more difficult. Recently the LEAD system was instituted in which undergraduates are trained to lead small discussion groups within the CDFL 350 course. The undergraduates are recruited, screened, and, if qualified, admitted to the program. During both semesters, LEAD students enroll in a three-credit course, "Seminar in Leadership Effectiveness", in which they receive instruction and training in various aspects of human relations and group dynamics (see Appendix A). During the first semester each LEAD student serves as an Assistant Leader in one of the twelve discussion groups within the CDFL 350 course. The second semester LEAD students become full leaders in the CDFL 350 discussion groups. Each discussion group has a Leader and an Assistant Leader who receive supervision and instruction by the Purdue LEAD Program staff. Consequently, the Purdue LEAD Program may be characterized as a dual-

approach instructional system in that it provides an undergraduate course in leadership aimed at developing skills particularly relevant to leading college discussion groups, and, at the same time, furnishes qualified and supervised discussion group leaders to enhance the effectiveness of instruction in the large marriage and family relationships course.

The LEAD program has a number of important advantages which establish its value to higher education in a wide variety of instructional settings. First, the LEAD program is self-contained in that only one instructor and two graduate teaching assistants are required. Second, the LEAD program is developmental in that each semester new students are added to the program who begin as assistant discussion group leaders serving as understudies to more advanced leaders and progress to full leadership responsibility following their semester of internship and participation in the weekly LEAD seminars. Third, the LEAD program is self-correcting in that a comprehensive system of evaluation and revision is built into all components of the system. Fourth, the LEAD program provides a medium for experimentation in various strategies of classroom instruction. New and innovative materials and procedures can be used in various discussion groups and their educational effectiveness immediately gauged. Finally, the LEAD program is generalizable in that it can be adopted by almost any course and department.

Future Directions

In addition to systemmatically evaluating the effectiveness of the LEAD program we are planning to initiate two additional projects soon if funding sources are secured. They are the Pyramid System of Instruction, and the Purdue Mature Undergraduate Student Trainee (MUST) Program.

Pyramid System of Instruction. The objective of the Pyramid project is to test the efficacy of a tri-level system of instruction contrasted with the straight lecture system. A typical week of instruction under the Pyramid System would begin with a large lecture session (n=200) which would introduce the topic area and identify its most important components. In the second weekly session, the class would be divided into four sections (n=50 students) and the session would include both instruction and class discussion. Approximately half of the sessions would be devoted to watching a television presentation (adopted from, for example, a film, slide presentation, panel discussion, interview) and the latter half of the session would be class discussion of the presentation led by LEAD students (three for each section). An experiment within the study would test the effectiveness of four competing modes of television presentation: conventional close-circuit cable system, a video cassette system, a video cartridge system, and a combination of all three. During the final session of the week students would be assigned to one of twelve small discussion groups (n=16 or 17) led by members of the LEAD program.

The major difference between the present system and the Pyramid System is the second session which replaces a large lecture with television presentation-discussion sections one-quarter the class size. Time devoted to preparing lecture material in the present system will be devoted to developing effective and interesting television presentations which could be used and improved from semester to semester.

The Purdue MUST Program. If sufficient funding could be found the MUST Program would provide ten undergraduate traineeships to Indiana residents thirty years of age or older who, except for the lack of money, would qualify for admission to Purdue. In addition to a normal course load the trainees would enroll in the LEAD program becoming discussion group leaders in the marriage and family relationships course. Because the MUST students have no doubt had considerable on-the-job training with regards to marriage and family relationships, they should add a more mature perspective to the often highly homogeneous (age, social class, culture, region) discussion groups they will lead.

The program would test the efficacy of an inexpensive system which should both relieve the anxiety of older adults about returning to school and utilize their years of experience to enhance undergraduate instruction. With few modifications, the program could be adopted by almost any institution or academic department.

Preliminary results of the evaluation of the LEAD program look very good and the full research report will be available at mid-year (see Figley, 1974 for the research proposal and Appendix B and C for two of the evaluation instruments).

The latter part of the paper will be devoted to a closer look at peer-instruction in general and its applicability to other educational contexts.

Conclusions about Peer-Instruction

It is clear from a pursual of the educational literature that the peer-instruction approach has permeated all levels of education: at the college level (e.g., Linden, Feldhusen, & Ames, in press; Alexander, 1974; Figley, Harrell, & Ridley, 1973; Morrison, 1972; Weikert, 1973; Wallace, 1974), at the high school

level (e.g., Baymur & Patterson, 1960; Caditz, 1963; Hassett, 1974) at the elementary school level (Briggs, 1967; Galvin & Shoup, no date; Gumaer, 1973; Kern & Kirby, 1969; Rime & Ham, 1968), and at the preschool level (Keislar & Blumenfield, 1972). Although a complete review of these programs is beyond the scope of this paper (McKeachie, 1971 and Rosenbaum, 1973, for extensive reviews) important conclusions may be drawn from them which should be considered before initiating a peer instruction system.

1. Peer-instruction can be utilized in most educational contexts (Keller, 1968; Fry, 1972; Gartner, 1971; Maas & Pressler, 1973; Rosenbaum, 1973).

2. Peer-instruction is equal or superior to more conventional approaches in (a) increasing the students; ability to think through substantive issues (e.g., Figley, et al, 1973; Gumaer, 1973; Wallace, 1974), (b) improving students' skills in human relations (e.g., Alexander, 1974; Gumaer, 1973; Weikert, 1973), and (c) academic improvement (e.g., Figley, et al, 1973; McKeachie, 1971; Morrison, 1972; Rosenbaum, 1973).

3. Few peer-instruction programs include adequate training for the students who will instruct their peers. (Rare exceptions other than the LEAD program are Figley, et al, 1973; Gumaer, 1973; Weikert, 1973; Wallace, 1974).

4. Few peer-instruction programs include systemmatic evaluation programs (See Figley, 1974).

5. Finally, no program other than the Purdue LEAD program is dual-level. In addition to providing discussion leaders the LEAD program attempts to increase the competence of the LEAD students beyond the minimum requirements for leading their groups. We feel that future use of the peer-instruction should include the personal development of peer instructors.

Implications and Recommendations

Educators planning to implement a program similar to the Purdue LEAD program should incorporate the following objectives:

1. Developing an open and supportive environment within which self-discovery learning takes place. Rogers and Coulson (1969), have suggested a number of elements important to facilitating significant learning. Among these elements are (a) whole-person involvement, both intellectually and affectively, (b) student-initiated sense of discovery with adequate encouragement from the environment, and (c) learner as the locus of evaluation and self-satisfaction as the index of progress. It is this kind of environment within which leaders will be trained and which they, in turn, will recreate for the groups they lead.

2. Increasing the level of interpersonal competence of the leaders. Egan (1973) has identified ten interpersonal components essential in a resource person in human relationships and groups.[1] His list includes empathy, warmth, respect, genuineness, concreteness (speaking about concrete experiences and behavior, being direct and specific), initiative, immediacy (dealing openly and directly with others), self-disclosure, feelings and emotions, confrontation, and self-exploration (Egan, 1973, p. 19).

3. Developing a comprehensive leader training system which includes a screening process, evaluation of all components of the program, effective supervision and support, gradual practicum experience (learning by doing one step at a time), and a structure in which beginners can learn from more experienced leaders.

---

[1] Similar lists have been developed by Carckhuff (1967), Figley (1972), and Holland and Baird (1968).

4. Lastly, before any program is initiated a number of issues must be considered which are related to the educational context within which the progrm will operate:

a. Is there a staff member who would be qualified as an instructor/director of the program?

b. What kind of system could be accommodated by scheduling procedures? For example, does the scheduling pattern of the school allow for six or nine week mini courses, semester courses, night classes? Scheduling has a significant impact on the methods of training peer-instructors/leaders.

c. Can various courses be structured to accommodate the program? There must be a minimally acceptable interface between the course structure and the discussion group structure.

d. Will the administration, the community and the students themselves support and promote the program? Adequate space and time to develop the program will be determined by the degree of support.

e. Will credit or some other kind of compensation be available to reward student leaders for their involvement?

f. How much authority and autonomy will be ascribed to the leaders? High levels of autonomy will require that the leaders have a minimum level of competence with course material and methods of instruction.

g. Will you choose peer-instructors/leaders from among older or same-age groups?

h. Will the students involved accept or reject peer-instruction/leadership? A freshman family life education course may not accept another freshman as a discussion group leader, but a senior leader may be much more acceptable.

i. Would a pass-nopass evaluation system be possible? The pass-nopass option may be more appropriate for peer-instruction since there would be less pressure of evaluation.

j. What is the motive for instituting a student leader system? Student leadership programs are not intended to become baby-sitting sessions, while teachers gain an opportunity for a coffee break. The success of a program, to a large degree, will depend on the active participation of the teacher in charge. The teacher must be a resource for leadership, supervision, guidance, training, evaluation, and encouragement.

References

Alexander, William. Report on small group experimentation in English 232 and English 436 under a grant from the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, Fall term, 1973. Unpublished paper, University of Michigan, 1974.

Baymur, F. B. and Patterson, C. H. A comparison of three methods of assisting underchieving high school students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7.

Briggs, Denise L. Older children teaching youngers. Journal of the California Teachers Association, January, 1967.

Caditz, B. Using student tutors in high school math: weak students profit from volunteer assistance, Chicago School Journal, 44-7, April, 1963.

Carckhuff, R. Toward a comprehensive model of facilitative interpersonal processes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 67-72.

Egan, G. Face to face. Monterey, California: Brooks/cole, 1973.

Figley, C. R. Social effectiveness: Conceptual formulation and component skills. Unpublished paper, 1972.

Figley, C. R. Students; academic and personal satisfaction inventory. Unpublished research instrument, the Pennsylvania State University, 1972A.

Figley, C. R., Harrell, J., and Ridley, C. Analysis of student-led discussion groups, process and outcomes. Unpublished research report, the Pennsylvania State University, 1973.

Figley, C. R. The leadership effectiveness and development (LEAD) program: development and utilization of student-led discussion groups in higher education. Unpublished research proposal, Purdue University, 1974.

Fry, John P. Interactive relationship between inquisitiveness and student control of instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, October, 1972, 63.

Galvin, John, and Mary Lynn Shoup. The use of peers in teaching reading to withdrawn children. U. S. Office of Education Grant G3-06-062063-1559, no date.

Gartner, Alan, et. al. Children teach children: learning by teaching, Harper & Row publishers, New York, 1971.

Gumaer, Jim. Peer-facilitated groups. Elementary school guidance and counseling, Summer, 1973, 8.

Hassett, J. Peer tutoring in New York City high schools. English Journal, April, 1974.

Holland, J. L. and Baird, L. L. An interpersonal competency scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 503-510.

Keislar, Evan R. and Blumenfield, Phyllis. A peer-tutoring game for four-year-olds. Early Childhood Research Center, California University, Los Angeles, March, 1972.

Keller, F. S. Goodbye, Teacher. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1.

Kern, R. and Kirby, J. H. Utilizing peer-helper influence in group counseling, elementary school guidance and counseling, 1969, 6.

Maas, James B. and Pressler, Virginia M. When students become teachers. Behavioral and Social Science Teacher, 1973, 1.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. Research on college teaching: A review. ERIC Clearing House on Higher Education, 1971.

Morrison, Eleanor S. Teaching human sexuality: the use of discussion groups and teaching aides in a college course. Family Coordinator, April 1972, 21.

Rime, Laura and Jane Ham. Sixth-grade tutors. The Instructor, March, 1967, 77 (7).

Rosenbaum, Peter S. Peer-mediated instruction. Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1973.

Rogers, C. R. and Coulson, W. R. Freedom to learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Wallace, Ruth A. An alternative to assembly-line education: Undergraduate teaching assistants. Teaching Sociology, October, 1974, 2.

Weikert, P. The use of undergraduates as facilitators in marriage, family, and sexuality courses. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Toronto, October, 1973.

Department of Child Development and Family Life
Purdue University

COURSE SYLLABUS

CDFL 590B (Spring, 1975) The Leadership Effectiveness and Development (LEAD) Program.
Professor Figley, 108 CDFL Bldg., 317 - 494-1351
Class: 6:00 - 7:30 p.m., Thursdays, 203 CDFL Bldg. and 8:30 - 9:30 a.m., Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, 210 HTWO.

Dates of Thursday Seminars	Topics
January 16, 1975:	General orientation to LEAD and CDFL 350, and first impressions.
January 23, 1975:	Introduction to Teaching and the Group Method
January 30, 1975:	Evaluation, and Encouraging Participation
February 6, 1975:	Human Communication, Verbal
February 13, 1975:	Human Communication, Nonverbal
February 20, 1975:	Helping Skills, Listener
February 27, 1975:	Helping Skills, Speaker
March 6, 1975:	Discovery Session I
March 20, 1975:	Discovery Session II
March 27, 1975:	Introduction to Classroom Games
April 3, 1975:	Psychodrama
April 10, 1975:	Sociodrama
April 17, 1975:	Group Process I
April 24, 1975:	Group Process II
May 1, 1975:	Critique and Discussion

The first part of the seminar will be devoted to a discussion of the tasks and experiences of the CDFL 350 discussion groups. The second half will cover the topic schedule (see above). Participants are expected to attend all sessions (lecture, discussion group, and seminar) and to take an active part.

MID-SEMESTER_____
END-SEMESTER_____

CRITERIA FOR CLASS PARTICIPATION GRADE

The discussion group participation grade will be judged by your leader or fellow students or both on the following criteria. In general the evaluation of your group performance will be based on two major dimensions: quantity and quality of participation. Circle the most appropriate subscore.

I. Quantity

Too Little Optimal

or

Too Much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

This means monopolizing the conversation or not speaking at all is detrimental to the group process. Assertiveness and risk-taking is necessary as well as a willingness to share your ideas.

II. Quality

Disinterested 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Responsive

This means that a responsive group member maintains eye contact with a speaker; focusses his attention on the group and really listens to what is being said. A disinterested member inhibits group process by focussing his attention outside the group; ignores others comments, is not supportive of other members, and speaks in the abstract rather than about his personal feelings.

Ego-oriented 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Group-oriented

This means that group-oriented members contribute to group growth by talking with group members rather than through the leader; picking up on and acknowledging other members statements; addressing himself to the other group members' feelings. The ego-oriented member contributes irrelevant material through story-telling, rambling, and general B.S. and an over-emphasis on relating past experiences.

Destructive Influence 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Positive Influence

This means that the member who exerts a positive influence on the group accepts the feelings and ideas of other members even if he disagrees with them. He questions but does not verbally attack or "tune out" other members. The destructive member alienates others by attacking, labeling, and threatening. He does not respect others' feelings.

III. Comments on the frequency of missing the discussion groups._____

_____

_____

TOTAL UNITS FOR PARTICIPATION_____

Purdue LEAD Program

Leadership Functions

The concept of leadership in a discussion group is influenced by the concepts and expectations of leadership held by members of the group, as well as by the concepts and expectations of leadership held by the person designated as "leader."

Member behavior, and hence leader behavior may be generally described in terms of (a) group functioning behaviors and (b) problem-solving behaviors. One listing of these behaviors is as follows:

Group Functioning Behaviors:

a. bring others into the conversation, encourage individual contributors, create receptive atmosphere

b. encourage expression of all shades of opinion, relieve conflict by emphasizing group goals

c. reconcile differences, seek middle ground, possibly modify one's own position

d. discourage useless repetition, sustain progress toward group goal

e. encourage critical evaluation of evidence of fact and opinion, and rational conclusions drawn from that evidence

f. make procedural suggestions during or after the discussion, encourage evaluation of one's own and others' contributions

Problem-Solving Behaviors:

a. ask for information and opinion eveidence

b. provide factual information and considered opinions

c. translate generalizations into concrete examples; project effects of a possible course of action

d. summarize ideas and clarify relations between and among them; attempt to redefine positions in terms of agreed objectives

e. apply group standards to group thought; evaluate by questioning evidence, argument, or application of a proposed solution

f. prod members to keep making progress toward group goals; seek settlement on a course of action

g. record important points and group decisions in writing; secure group acceptance of the written record.

Negative behaviors, which should be discouraged, include: dominating the discussion by talking too much; repeatedly criticizing contributions of others; repeatedly interrupting others; persisting in consideration of points previously agreed to or rejected; unreasoned rejection of others' evidence, argument or proposed solutions; pressing for agreement before full consideration has been achieved; refusal to share ideas.

Any or all of these behaviors may be performed by members and/or the leader at any time. It is apparent that if "the leader" assumes all of the behaviors at all times, he becomes the sole contributor or, if you will, a lecturer. Others in the group are left without involvement. It follows, then, that these behaviors (or any equivalent listing of all possible alternatives) must be shared among all the members of the group, including that member of that member who wears the designation of "leader."

The particular selection and the degree of concentration of behaviors performed by the leader give rise to the characterization of his leadership as "democratic," "authoritarian," or the like.

Source: XXXXX

Aeur, J. & Eubank, H.L. A Concept of leadership for discussion groups. Southern Speech Journal, 1954, 14 (May), 283-293.

PURDUE LEAD PROGRAM

WEEKLY DISCUSSION GROUP CRITIQUE FORM

Leader name_____ Week_____ Section #_____

Assistant leader_____ Date_____

A. Fill out before the session.

1. What are your goals for this discussion?

2. How do you plan to reach these goals? (Techniques or questions you will use).

3. Did you discuss goals with your assistant leader?
_____yes _____no Comments?_____

_____

B. Fill out after the session.

1. Did you accomplish your goals? _____yes _____no

2. What things did you do well?

3. How might you have improved your leadership or the session?

4. Did you receive verbal feedback from assistant leader and/or observer?

_____yes _____no Comments?_____

_____

Date_____

LEAD SEMINAR EVALUATION FORM

Please write your reaction to tonight's session. Did you benefit from it?

How might it have been improved?

Comments, suggestions, criticisms.

How would you rate this workshop as being personally relevant and helpful to you?

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Purdue LEAD Program

Basic Considerations Regarding Small

Discussion Groups

A. Benefits of Discussion
   1. Individual goals
      a. to stimulate the desire for good evidence and logical thinking
      b. to learn to give and take criticism
      c. to learn when and how to compromise
      d. to develop a direct conversational manner of speaking

   2. Group goals
      a. to formulate and clarify specific problems
      b. to exchange information
      c. to clarify and evaluate attitudes and values
      d. to release tensions
      e. to reinforce socially accepted values (legitimate when clearly stated)

B. Inherent Limitations of the Discussion Process
   1. Discussion is a slow process
   2. Discussion is an inefficient process when members lack adequate information concerning the topic.
   3. Discussion is a poor method for considering questions of fact (as distinct from questions of belief, values, or policy).
   4. Discussion seldom provides an orderly analysis.

C. Common Faults Appearing in Discussion Groups
   1. Lack of immediate preparation for a particular discussion (i.e. failure to gather information and/or to organize information and ideas)
   2. Concealing real differences; agreeing for agreement's sake
   3. One-sidedness - - Discussion groups can be dominated by advocates of one point of view, either through their concerted efforts or through pushing successfully for premature agreement.

D. Common Misconceptions
   1. Agreement is no sure test of success
      a. There are no good discussions in which people disagree violently.
      b. When agreement comes too easily on a controversial subject, one suspects that the thinking has been superficial, or that real differences have been concealed.

2. There may be silent participation
   a. Active, intelligent listening is an important and neccessary part of discussion.
   b. Sometimes, the greatest contribution any member can make, at a given moment, is to keep quiet and listen to someone else. At the same time, if the underlying assumption of discussion is reasonable, one would not expect that any given person would make his total contribution through listening, any more than he would make his total contribution through speaking.

3. Discussion may not "settle" anything. The purpose may, indeed, be to "unsettle" people in order to generate thought about a problem.

Source:

Fwbank, H.L. & Auer, J.J. Discussion and Debate: Tools of a Democracy. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts. (2nd ed.), 1951, 270-275.

As a means of improving classes dealing with intimate human relationships, we are asking you to complete the following questionnaire. In no way will your answers be used to determine your grade in the course. Please use a pencil and the computer scoring cards to record your answers.

I. Background Information

1. Sex
   a. female b. male

2. Your Age

   a. 17 b. 18 c. 19 d. 20
   e. 21 c. 22 g. 23 h. 24 or over

3. Your term standing

   a. 1-2 b. 3-4 c. 5-6 d. 7-8
   e. 9-10 f. 11-12 g. over 12

4. Residence
   a. dormitory b. fraternity/sorority
   c. with parents d. rooming house
   e. apt. or house with one or more same sex roommates
   f. apartment alone
   g. apartment with one opposite-sex roommate
   h. apartment or house with more than one opposite-sex roommate
   i. apartment or house shared with people of both sexes
   j. other_____

5. Marital status
   a. single, never married b. married
   c. married but separated d. divorced
   e. other_____

6. Overall grade point average
   a. 0.00-3.99 b. 4.00-4.49
   c. 4.50-4.99 d. 5.00-5.49
   e. 5.50-6.00

7. Area that best describes your major field of study
   a. biological sciences b. social/behavioral sciences
   c. humanities d. physical sciences
   e. fine arts, performing arts
   f. education g. math, computer science
   h. business i. engineering
   j. other)_____

8. Size of your family or origin
   a. self b. 2 c. 3
   d. 4 e. 5 f. 6
   g. 7 h. 8 i. 9
   j. 10 or more

II. Questions

Instructions: We would like to have your opinion on each of the following statements. Your response will indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree. Please continue to indicate your answers on the computer card and use the code shown below:

a. very strongly agree
b. strongly agree
c. agree
d. mildly agree
e. no opinion
f. mildly disagree
g. disagree
h. strongly disagree
i. very strongly disagree

9. It appears to me that some couples are never adequately prepared for marriage no matter how long they date.

10. The success of my marriage will be partly related to the problems we resolve during our courtship.

11. Today it is necessary for husbands and wives to be flexible in the duties they expect each other to perform.

12. If I had a good sexual relationship with my spouse, most of our other marital problems would take care of themselves.

13. If my marital problems become unbearable, I would seek professional counseling.

14. There is little that a single or married individual can learn through a course in family life education.

15. "When to marry" may be just as important for me as "whom to marry."

16. A wife has to be more willing and able to adapt in a marriage then the husband.

17. I think divorced individuals are disturbed individuals.

18. There are some relevant scientific research findings which will aid me in understanding and preparing for my marriage.

19. The patterns of behavior I establish during my serious dating with a person will be carried over into our engagement.

20. I expect to spend a couple of years in learning how to make our marriage mutually satisfying.

21. The husband should have the final word in most of the decisions in the family.

22. Masturbation is <u>not</u> physically harmful to me.

23. I expect marriage to help change or reform my fiance(e).

24. My understanding of sex and human reproduction is adequate.

25. The way my steady acts while we are dating is <u>not</u> a good indication of how she or he will act if we are married.

26. I believe that individuals who love each other will rarely have disagreements or arguments.

27. Patterns of behavior and interaction we develop during our early years of marriage are frequently persistent and hard to modify.

28. It would be beneficial to our relationship, if I really understood my spouse's feelings and ideas.

29. It is difficult for me to talk with anyone regarding my feelings regarding love, sex, and marriage.

30. I think married individuals are generally happier if they are married to persons with similar personalities and family backgrounds.

31. Finances are seldom a cause for concern in the first years of marriage.

32. A husband and wife should share most activities and have little personal privacy.

33. The type and frequency of my sexual behavior is probably somewhat different from those of others in the United States.

34. Sympathetic friends are usually good counselors when marital conflicts arise.

35. I would like my potential spouse and myself to have some pre-marital counseling.

36. Most of my courtship problems will simply take care of themselves.

37. Before marriage, the best and truest love for me is one without sexual feelings.

38. The woman's main responsibility in the family is to the children.

39. My sexual adjustment in marriage will result more from proper techniques than from my attitude toward sex.

40. If my steady and I were having difficulties, engagement would help resolve our problems.

41. For the sake of my children and their adjustment, keeping the family together would be preferrable to divorce.

42. I feel embarrassed and uneasy when I talk about sex with members of the opposite sex.

We are trying to find out what your reactions are to the discussion session you have been attending in CDFL 350. The honesty with which you respond to the following statements will give us accurate results and help us to constantly improve the discussion group experience. Please put your discussion group number on the sensing card along with your answers. Do not include your name.

Thank you for your valuable assistance.

INSTRUCTIONS: (a) Please consider each of the following statements as it applies to your general feelings about your experiences in the weekly discussion groups. (b) Consider the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement. (c) Finally, indicate your response on the attached computer answer sheet by marking a, b, c, d, or e as coded below.

Code: a=STRONGLY AGREE, b+AGREE, c=NO OPINION, d=DISAGREE, e=STRONGLY DISAGREE

---

1. The discussion groups helped me understand the lecture.
2. 2. I feel close to most of the group members.
3. Discussions often dwelled on the obvious.
4. The material covered in the discussion group each week was highly relevant to dating, courtship, and marriage.
5. The discussion groups helped me in learning the content of the course reading assignments.
6. I enjoyed going to the discussion group meetings each week.
7. Being a part of this group increased my interest in the couse as a whole.
8. I frequently found it difficult to follow the discussions.
9. The things I've learned and experienced in the weekly discussions have helped me solve problems I was having with friends and partners.
10. If I were signing up for this course knowing what I know now, I would try to get into the same discussion group.
11. The personal reaction papers (PRP) assignment was valuable to me personally.
12. The PRP assignment contributed to my understanding of the course content.
13. I think I will make a better partner in a love relationship as a result of attending these discussions.

14. Generally speaking, I'm satisfied with the grading process in my discussion group.

15. As a result of the discussion group, I seem to communicate better.

16. The discussion group sessions have helped me develop my interpersonal skills.

17. Sometimes I felt a little left out of the discussions.

18. Most of the time I looked forward to attending the discussion sessions.

19. Generally speaking, I was satisfied that the discussion group sessions were worth my time.

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS: The latter section includes statements about your discussion group leader.

Responses for your leader are numbered 20 through 36.

Responses for your assistant leader,, if you have one, should be from 37 through 53.

(37) 20. _____often expressed his/her feelings with group members.

(38) 21. _____helped keep the discussion going when things got slow.

(39) 22. _____asked challenging questions which made me think about different points of view.

(40) 23. _____was fair in evaluating my participation.

(41) 24. _____clearly explained the goals of our discussion group at the beginning of the term.

(42) 25. _____helped group members accept each other's opinions and feelings, even when they seemed very different.

(43) 26. _____discussed things about him/herself that made me feel uncomfortable.

(44) 27. _____always seemed interested in my opinions.

(45) 28. _____knows how to use humor effectively.

(46) 29. _____frequently dominated the discussion.

(47) 30. _____seemed rather aloof from the other group members.

(48) 31. _____was open to constructive criticism.

(49) 32. _____seems enthusiastic about the course.

(50) 33. _____has a thorough knowledge of the course content.

(51) 34. _____seemed open-minded (i.e. accepted other's opinions even when they were different from his/her own).

(52) 35. _____helped others clarify what they were trying to say.

(53) 36. _____did a good job in giving everyone the opportunity to contribute their opinions.

Again, if you have an assistant group leader please respond to the same questions using the series of numbers 37-53 on your computer answer sheet. Thanks.